arXiv:1403.4622v2 [math.GR] 20 Mar 2014

# COMPLETE SIMULTANEOUS CONJUGACY INVARIANTS IN GARSIDE GROUPS

ARKADIUS KALKA, BOAZ TSABAN, AND GARY VINOKUR

Abstract. We provide the first effectively computable, modulo a mild conjecture, complete invariant for simultaneous conjugacy in Garside groups. This invariant generalizes the notion of super summit set of a conjugacy class, and provides a solution of the simultaneous conjugacy problem in Garside groups, of complexity a small degree polynomial in the sizes of the invariant and the input parameters. Computer experiments suggest that the size of this invariant, for a list of $O(N)$ generic, independent elements of Artin's braid group $\mathrm{B}_N$, is close to 1.

## 1. Introduction

In 1911, Dehn formulated three fundamental algorithmic problems concerning groups: the Word Problem, the Conjugacy Problem, and the Group Isomorphism Problem. The *Word Problem* is that of deciding whether two words in given symmetric generators of a group represent the same element or, equivalently, whether a word in these generators represents the identity element. The *Conjugacy Problem* is that of deciding whether two group elements are conjugate. A variation of this problem is to find, given two conjugate group elements, a witness conjugator. It is customary to refer to this variation as the *search* version of the Conjugacy Problem.

The Conjugacy Problem generalizes the Word Problem. A yet more general problem is the *Simultaneous Conjugacy Problem (SCP)*: say that $r$-tuples $(g_1, \dots, g_r)$ and $(h_1, \dots, h_r)$ of elements of a group $G$ are *conjugate* if there is $x \in G$ such that

$$(g_1, \dots, g_r)^x := (g_1^x, \dots, g_r^x) = (h_1, \dots, h_r).$$

(Throughout, for $g$ and $x$ in $G$, we use the notation $g^x := x^{-1}gx$.) The ($r$-dimensional) SCP is that of deciding whether two $r$-tuples of group elements are conjugate. The search version of this problem is defined in the obvious manner, and will be referred to as the *Search SCP*.

A number of computational problems in braid groups reduce to to the SCP in these groups. For example, Dehornoy's *Shifted Conjugacy Problem* [6] was reduced to the SCP via reduction to the Subgroup Conjugacy Problem for the braid group $\mathrm{B}_{N-1}$ in $\mathrm{B}_N$ [19]. The latter problem and, more generally, the Subgroup Conjugacy Problem for $\mathrm{B}_M$ in $\mathrm{B}_N$ (for $M < N$) was reduced to the SCP in $\mathrm{B}_N$ in [14]. In a sequel paper [21], we show that the *Double Coset Problem*, which is undecideable for general subgroups of the braid groups, reduces to the SCP in the braid groups when the subgroups considered are parabolic with connected Coxeter graph. Given the results of the present paper, this forms the first solution of the Double Coset Problem for this family of groups and subgroups.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F36.

*Key words and phrases.* Garside groups, braid group, conjugacy invariant, simultaneous conjugacy problem, super summit set, minimal simple element.

Another motivation for the SCP is that the security of a number of proposals of cryptographic key exchange protocols can be reduced to the Search SCP in Artin's braid groups. In Section 2, we provide such reductions for several prominent examples. It should be noted that, in the case where $G$ is a braid group, there have been found in the meanwhile *polynomial time* solutions of the problems on which these protocols are based [4, 27, 28]. These polynomial time solutions do not address the (formally harder) SCP. For the lack of a general, polynomial-dimension representation theory for Garside groups, these solutions do not generalize to arbitrary Garside groups. More importantly, from a *heuristic* point of view, the SCP is lurking in practically all braid-based cryptographic protocols proposed thus far, including ones hitherto not cryptanalyzed. This suggests that, in order to understand the potential of braid groups in cryptography, the full-fledged SCP must be addressed.

Our main result is a deterministic, effective solution to the (decision and search version of the) SCP in arbitrary Garside groups. Earlier, Lee and Lee provided a solution in Artin's braid groups [23], that extends to Garside groups with weighted presentations. An attractive feature of our solution is that, unlike the earlier solution, it provides a *complete finite invariant* of the conjugacy class of an $r$-tuple. Some consideration is given for improving the efficiency of our algorithms. The paper concludes with experimental results, in braid groups, showing a considerable improvement over the earlier, specialized solutions.

## 2. Reductions of computational problems to the SCP

In the original instantiations of the problems below, the group $G$ was Artin's braid group, but the protocols, problems and reductions apply in arbitrary groups. The security of the *Braid Diffie–Hellman* protocol, introduced in [22], is based on the difficulty of the following problem.[1]

**Problem 2.1.** *Let $A$ and $B$ be subgroups of $G$ with $[A, B] = 1$, and let $g \in G$ be given. Given a pair $(g^a, g^b)$ where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, find $g^{ab}$.*

**Proposition 2.2.** *Problem 2.1 reduces to the Search SCP.*

*Proof.* Let $b_1, \ldots, b_r$ be generators of $B$. Find $\tilde{a} \in G$ such that

$$(g, b_1, \ldots, b_r)^{\tilde{a}} = (g^a, b_1, \ldots, b_r).$$

(Note that $\tilde{a} := a$ satisfies this identity). Then $[\tilde{a}, B] = 1$, and

$$g^{ab} = (g^a)^b = (g^{\tilde{a}})^b = g^{\tilde{a}b} = g^{b\tilde{a}} = (g^b)^{\tilde{a}},$$

which can be computed having $g^b$ and $\tilde{a}$. □

The *Double Coset* protocol, introduced in [5], is a generalization of the mentioned Braid Diffie–Hellman protocol, and its security is based on the difficulty of the following, more general problem.

**Problem 2.3.** *Let $A_1$, $A_2$, $B_1$ and $B_2$ be subgroups of $G$ with $[A_1, B_1] = [A_2, B_2] = 1$, and let $g \in G$ be given. Given a pair $(a_1 g a_2, b_1 g b_2)$ where $a_i \in A_i$ and $b_i \in B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, find $a_1 b_1 g a_2 b_2$.*

**Proposition 2.4.** *Problem 2.3 reduces to the Search SCP.*

[1] Throughout, we assume that each mentioned group is provided in terms of a finite generating set. For simplicity of notation, we assume that all generating sets have size $r$.

*Proof.* Let $b_{i1}, \ldots, b_{ir}$ be generators of $B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. For each $b \in B_1$ of our choice, since $[a_1, B_1] = 1$, we have that $b^{ga_2} = b^{a_1 ga_2}$ is known. Find $\tilde{a}_2 \in G$ such that

$$(b_{11}^g, \ldots, b_{1r}^g, b_{21}, \ldots, b_{2r})^{\tilde{a}_2} = (b_{11}^{ga_2}, \ldots, b_{1r}^{ga_2}, b_{21}, \ldots, b_{2r}).$$

Then $[\tilde{a}_2, B_2] = 1$, and $[(ga_2)(g\tilde{a}_2)^{-1}, B_1] = 1$. Compute $\tilde{a}_1 = (a_1 ga_2)(g\tilde{a}_2)^{-1} = a_1(ga_2)(g\tilde{a}_2)^{-1}$. Then $[\tilde{a}_1, b_1] = 1$, and thus

$$\tilde{a}_1(b_1 g b_2)\tilde{a}_2 = b_1\tilde{a}_1 g\tilde{a}_2 b_2 = b_1 a_1 g a_2 b_2 = a_1 b_1 g a_2 b_2,$$

which can be computed from $b_1 g b_2$, $\tilde{a}_1$ and $\tilde{a}_2$. □

The security of the *Commutator* protocol, introduced in [1], is based on the difficulty of the following problem.

**Problem 2.5.** *Let $A$ and $B$ be subgroups of $G$. Given $A^b$ and $B^a$, where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, find the commutator $[a, b]$.*

It is open whether Problem 2.5 provably reduces to the Search SCP, but we have the following result. To motivate the following two results, we note that, generically, the centralizer of subgroups of the braid group is equal to the center of the entire group, and in particular needs no computation.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Problem 2.5 reduces to the conjunction of the Search SCP and computing the centralizer of a finite set of elements.*

*Proof.* Let $a_1, \ldots, a_r$, $b_1, \ldots, b_r$, $c_1, \ldots, c_r$ and $d_1, \ldots, d_r$ be generators of $A$, $B$ and their centralizers $\mathrm{C}(A)$ and $\mathrm{C}(B)$, respectively. Find $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in G$ such that

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_r, d_1, \ldots, d_r)^{\tilde{b}} = (a_1^b, \ldots, a_r^b, d_1, \ldots, d_r).$$

and

$$(b_1, \ldots, b_r, c_1, \ldots, c_r)^{\tilde{a}} = (b_1^a, \ldots, b_r^a, c_1, \ldots, c_r).$$

Then $a^{\tilde{b}} = a^b$. Also, $\tilde{a}a^{-1} \in \mathrm{C}(B)$ and $[\tilde{b}, \mathrm{C}(B)] = 1$. In particular, $[\tilde{b}, \tilde{a}a^{-1}] = 1$. Compute

$$\tilde{a}^{-1}\tilde{b}^{-1}\tilde{a}\tilde{b} = \tilde{a}^{-1}\tilde{b}^{-1}(\tilde{a}a^{-1})a\tilde{b} = \tilde{a}^{-1}(\tilde{a}a^{-1})\tilde{b}^{-1}a\tilde{b} = a^{-1}a^{\tilde{b}} = a^{-1}a^b = [a, b]. \quad \square$$

The *Centralizer* protocol was introduced in [26]. Its security is based on the following problem.

**Problem 2.7.** *Let $g, a_1, b_2 \in G$, $C \leq \mathrm{C}(a_1)$, $D \leq \mathrm{C}(b_2)$, $a_2 \in D$ and $b_1 \in C$. Given $g$, $C$, $D$, $a_1 g a_2$ and $b_1 g b_2$, compute $a_1 b_1 g a_2 b_2$.*

**Proposition 2.8.** *Problem 2.7 reduces to the conjunction of the Search SCP and computing the centralizer of a finite set of elements.*

*Proof.* Let $c_1, \ldots, c_r$ and $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ be generators of $C$ and $\mathrm{C}(D)$, respectively. For each $c \in C$, we can compute $c^{a_1 ga_2} = c^{ga_2}$. Find $\tilde{a}_2 \in G$ such that

$$(c_1^g, \ldots, c_r^g, e_1, \ldots, e_r)^{\tilde{a}_2} = (c_1^{ga_2}, \ldots, c_r^{ga_2}, e_1, \ldots, e_r).$$

Let $\tilde{a}_1 = (a_1 ga_2)(g\tilde{a}_2)^{-1}$. Then $\tilde{a}_1 = a_1((ga_2)(g\tilde{a}_2)^{-1}) \in \mathrm{C}(C)$, and thus $[\tilde{a}_1, b_1] = 1$. Also, $[\tilde{a}_2, \mathrm{C}(D)] = 1$ and $b_2 \in \mathrm{C}(D)$. Thus, $[\tilde{a}_2, b_2] = 1$. It follows that

$$\tilde{a}_1(b_1 g b_2)\tilde{a}_2 = b_1\tilde{a}_1 g\tilde{a}_2 b_2 = b_1 a_1 g a_2 b_2 = a_1 b_1 g a_2 b_2. \quad \square$$

## 3. Background on Garside groups

Garside groups form a generalization of braid groups where Garside's solution to the conjugacy problem in braid groups applies [24]. They were originally introduced in [9], but the definition was slightly generalized later [24]. A large number of examples of Garside groups can be found in [8]. These include, in addition to Artin's braid groups, all Artin groups of finite type and torus link groups [25].

Let $M$ be a monoid and $a, b \in M$. $a$ is a *left divisor of* $b$ *(*$a \preceq b$*)* if $b \in aM$. $a$ is *right divisor of* $b$ *(*$b \succeq a$*)* if $b \in Ma$. $a$ is a *divisor* of $b$ if it is a left or a right divisor of $b$. $\mathrm{Div}(b)$ is the set of divisors of $b$. $b$ is *balanced* if the sets of left and right divisors of $b$ coincide.

A monoid $M$ is *Noetherian* if for each element $a \in M$ there is an integer $n$ such that $a$ cannot be expressed as the product of more than $n$ nonidentity elements. An element $a \neq 1$ in $M$ is an *atom* if $a = bc$ implies $b = 1$ or $c = 1$. A set generates a Noetherian monoid $M$ if and only if it includes all atoms of $M$.

Let $M$ be a finitely generated, cancellative Noetherian monoid. The relations $\preceq$ and $\succeq$ are partial orders, and every element of $M$ admits only finitely many left and right divisors [9]. An element $m \in M$ is a *right lcm* of $a$ and $b$ if $a, b \preceq m$, and whenever $a \preceq c$ and $b \preceq c$, we have that $m \preceq c$. A *left lcm* is defined symmetrically, using the relation $\succeq$. Right and left lcms of pairs $a$ and $b$ are unique, and are denoted $a \vee b$ and $a \tilde{\vee} b$, respectively. If $a \vee b$ exists, then there is a unique element $c$ such that $a \vee b = ac$. This element $c$ is the *right complement (or residue) of* $a$ *in* $b$, and it is denoted by $a\backslash b$. We define the *left complement* symmetrically. In particular, we have $a \vee b = a(a\backslash b) = b(b\backslash a)$, and $a \tilde{\vee} b = (b/a)a = (a/b)b$.

A monoid $M$ is *Gaussian* if it is Noetherian, cancellative, and every pair of elements $a, b \in M$ admits a right and a left lcm. Let $M$ be a Gaussian monoid. For every pair of elements $a$ and $b$, the set of common left divisors of $a$ and $b$ is finite and admits a right lcm, which is therefore the greatest common left divisor of $a$ and $b$, denoted by $a \wedge b$. The *right gcd* $a \tilde{\wedge} b$ is defined symmetrically. $M$ is a lattice with respect to the relations $\preceq$ and $\succeq$. Also, $M$ embeds in its group of right fractions, and, symmetrically, in its group of left fractions. These two groups coincide, and therefore we may speak of the group of fractions of $M$.

**Definition 3.1.** A *Garside group* is a group $G$ equipped with a finite subset $S$ and an element $\Delta$ such that the monoid $G^+$ generated by $S$ is Gaussian with $G$ is its group of fractions, $\Delta \in G^+$ is a balanced element, and $S = \mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$.

In this case, we say that $G^+$ is a *Garside monoid*, $\Delta$ the *Garside element*, and the elements of $S$ are the *simple elements* of $G$.

Let $G$ be a Garside group. There may be several choices of $S$ and $\Delta$ witnessing that, and we always assume, tacitly, that $S$ and $\Delta$ are fixed in the background. The set $S$ is closed under the operators $\backslash$, $/$, $\vee$, $\tilde{\vee}$, $\wedge$ and $\tilde{\wedge}$. Indeed, $S$ is the closure of the atoms of $G^+$ under $\backslash$ and $\vee$. The functions $\partial\colon a \mapsto a\backslash\Delta$ and $\tilde{\partial}\colon a \mapsto \Delta/a$ map $G^+$ onto $S$, and the restrictions $\partial|_S$, $\tilde{\partial}|_S$ are bijections of $S$ satisfying $\tilde{\partial}|_S = (\partial|_S)^{-1}$. In particular, we have that $\partial^2(a) = \tau(a)$ and $\tilde{\partial}^2 = \tau^{-1}(a)$ for all $a \in S$, where $\tau$ denotes the inner automorphism of $G$ defined by $a \mapsto \Delta^{-1}a\Delta$.

The partial orders $\preceq$ and $\succeq$ on $G^+$ extend naturally to partial orders on the whole Garside group $G$. Define a partial order on $G$ by $a \leq b$ if there are $c, c' \in G^+$ such that $b = cac'$. For $a, b \in G$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that $a \preceq \Delta^k \preceq b$ if and only if $b \succeq \Delta^k \succeq a$ if and only if

$a \leq \Delta^k \leq b$. For $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the *interval*

$$[p, q] := \{\, a \in G : \Delta^p \leq a \leq \Delta^q \,\}.$$

The *infimum* and the *supremum* of an element $a \in G$, denoted $\inf a$ and $\sup a$, respectively, are the maximal $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the minimal $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a \in [p, q]$.

Let $G$ be a Garside group. The (left) *normal form* of an element $a \in G^+$ is a unique decomposition $a = s_1 \cdots s_l$ such that $s_i = \Delta \wedge (s_i \cdots s_l) \in S$ for all $i$, and $s_l \neq 1$. The length $l$ of this decomposition is the *canonical length* of $a$. The normal form of a general element $a$ is obtained by expressing $a = \Delta^{\inf a} a^+$ for the unique $a^+ \in G^+$, and decomposing $a^+$ to its normal form. The *canonical length* of $a$ is defined to be that of $a^+$. The right normal form of an element is defined symmetrically.

## 4. The basic solution

The solution provided in [24] for the Conjugacy Problem in Garside groups extends to the SCP by choosing appropriate coordinate-wise generalization of the involved notions. For a natural number $r$, the partial order $\leq$ of $\mathbb{Z}$ extends to a partial order of $\mathbb{Z}^r$ coordinate-wise: for $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_r)$ and $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_r)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^r$, we define $p \leq q$ if $p_i \leq q_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. For an $r$-tuple $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_r)$ of elements of a Garside group $G$, let

$$a^G := \{\, a^g : g \in G \,\} = \{\, (a_1^g, \ldots, a_r^g) : g \in G \,\},$$

the (simultaneous) *conjugacy class* of $a$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \inf a &:= (\inf a_1, \ldots, \inf a_r); \\ \sup a &:= (\sup a_1, \ldots, \sup a_r). \end{aligned}$$

For $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $p \leq q$, define the following *interval*:

$$\begin{aligned} [p, q] &= \{\, a \in G^r : p \leq \inf a \text{ and } \sup a \leq q \,\} \\ &= \{\, (a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in G^r : p_i \leq \inf a_i \text{ and } \sup a_i \leq q_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, r \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group, and let $r$ be a natural number. For all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, the interval $[p, q]$ is finite.*

*Proof.* The one-dimensional case ($r = 1$) is proved in [24]. In the case $r > 1$, we have that

$$[p, q] = [p_1, q_1] \times \cdots \times [p_r, q_r]$$

is finite, as a product of finitely many one-dimensional intervals. □

**Lemma 4.2** ([24, Lemma 2.3])**.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group. Then, for all $\alpha, \beta \in G^+$, $\Delta \leq \alpha\beta$ implies $\Delta \leq \alpha(\beta \wedge \Delta)$.*

Since the set $S$ of simple elements in a Garside group is finite and $\tau \colon S \to S$ a bijection, there is a natural number $k$ such that $\tau^k$ is the identity map. Then $\Delta^k$ is in the center of $G$. Assume that $a, c \in G$ are conjugate by $x \in G$. Then, for large enough $m$, they are also conjugate by $\Delta^{mk} x$, which is in $G^+$. It follows that the same holds for $a, c \in G^r$ for arbitrary $r$.

**Theorem 4.3** (Simultaneous Convexity)**.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group. Let $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and let $a, c \in [p, q]$ be conjugate. We may assume that $c = a^x = a^{\tilde{x}^{-1}}$ for some $x, \tilde{x} \in G^+$. Let $x_1 = \Delta \wedge x$ and $\tilde{x}_1 = x \mathbin{\tilde{\wedge}} \Delta$, the leftmost and rightmost simple factors of $x$, respectively. Then $a^{x_1}, a^{\tilde{x}_1^{-1}} \in [p, q]$.*

*Proof.* For $r = 1$ this is [24, Proposition 3.2]. It follows that, for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, we have that $a_i^{x_1}, a_i^{\tilde{x}_1^{-1}} \in [p_i, q_i]$, and thus $a^{x_1}, a^{\tilde{x}_1^{-1}} \in [p, q]$. □

The one-dimensional version of the following corollary is established in [24, Proposition 3.3].

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group, and $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. For all conjugate $a, c \in [p, q]$, there are $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_l \in [p, q]$ and simple elements $s_1, \ldots, s_l$ such that $v_0 = a$, $v_l = c$, and $v_i^{s_{i+1}} = v_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Schematically:*

$$a \xrightarrow{s_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{s_2} v_2 \xrightarrow{s_3} \cdots \xrightarrow{s_{l-1}} v_{l-1} \xrightarrow{s_l} c.$$

*Proof.* There is $x \in G^+$ be such that $a^x = c$. The assertion follows by applying the Simultaneous Convexity Theorem 4.3, $l$ times where $l$ is the canonical length of $x$. □

We obtain an extension of [24, Corollary 3.4] to the simultaneous setting.

**Theorem 4.5.** *The SCP in Garside groups is solvable.*

*Proof.* Given $a, c \in G^r$, fix $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $p \leq \inf a, \inf c$ and $\sup a, \sup c \leq q$. Then $a, c \in [p, q]$, and they are conjugate if and only if $c \in a^G \cap [p, q]$.

By Lemma 4.1, the set $a^G \cap [p, q]$ is finite, and by Corollary 4.4, this set can be generated by starting with $a$ and iteratively conjugating with simple elements, keeping only the conjugates that remain in $[p, q]$, until no new elements of $[p, q]$ are obtained (Algorithm 1).

The Search SCP is solved by keeping track of the conjugating elements when constructing the set $a^G \cap [p, q]$. □

**Algorithm 1** Compute $a^G \cap [p, q]$, for $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $a \in [p, q]$.

```
W := ∅; V := {a}
repeat
    Take v ∈ V
    for all s ∈ S do
        u := (v_1^s, ..., v_r^s)
        if u ∈ [p, q] and u ∉ W then
            V := V ∪ {u}
        end if
    end for
    W := W ∪ {v}; V := V \ {v}
until V = ∅
return W
```

In the case of the braid groups, a variation of the solution presented here was provided by Lee and Lee [23]. The Lee–Lee solution uses, instead of intervals $[p, q]$, intervals of the form

$$[p, \infty] = \{\, a \in G^r : p \leq \inf a \,\}.$$

While these intervals are finite for braid groups, and more generally for Garside groups with weighted presentation, they might potentially be infinite in some Garside groups, in which case the Lee–Lee solution to the SCP may not terminate in finite time.

The solution presented here is infeasible in practice, for two reasons: The intervals used may be too large, and each step in the algorithm consists of conjugating by all simple

elements. In the braid group $\mathrm{B}_N$ with both known Garside structures, there are exponentially many (in $N$) simple elements. We address both issues in the coming sections.

## 5. Moving to minimal intervals

Let $G$ be a Garside group and $a, c \in G^r$. The solution to the SCP for $a$ and $c$ described in the previous section is by choosing some interval $[p, q]$ containing $a$ and $c$ and computing the set $a^G \cap [p, q]$. Increasing $p$ or decreasing $q$—in the coordinate-wise order—may reduce the size of this set considerably.

The following lemma generalizes [23, Proposition 1].

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group. Let $a \in G$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $a^G \cap [p, q] \neq \emptyset$. Let $c \in [p, q]$ and $x \in G^+$ be such that $c^x = a$. Write $a = \Delta^k a_1 \cdots a_l$ in left normal form, and $a = \tilde{a}_l \cdots \tilde{a}_1 \Delta^k$ in right normal form.*

1. *If $\inf a < p$, then $x \succeq \Delta\tau^{-k}(a_1^{-1}) \in S$ and $\tau^k(\tilde{a}_1^{-1})\Delta \preceq x$.*
2. *If $q < \sup a$, then $x \succeq a_l$ and $\tilde{a}_l \preceq x$.*

*Proof.* (1) As $k = \inf a < p \leq \inf c$, we have that $c = \Delta^k c'$ with $\Delta \leq c'$. Thus,

$$c'x = \Delta^{-k} cx = \Delta^{-k} xa = \Delta^{-k} x \Delta^k a_1 \cdots a_l = \tau^k(x) a_1 \cdots a_l \geq \Delta.$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have that $\Delta \leq \tau^k(x) a_1$, and thus $x\tau^{-k}(a_1) \succeq \Delta$. By right-invariance of $\succeq$, we have that $x \succeq \Delta\tau^{-k}(a_1^{-1})$. The proof for the left divisor is symmetric.

(2) Similar. □

Algorithm 2 may be used to conjugate an $r$-tuple into a prescribed interval, assuming that this is possible. In the case of the braid groups and with an interval of the form $[\inf c, \infty]$ (where $c$ is conjugate to $a$) instead of $[p, q]$ and with $M = \infty$, this algorithm is due to Lee and Lee [23]. Here, for example, one may take the smaller interval $[\inf c, \sup c]$.

**Algorithm 2** Given $a \in G^r$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, find $y \in G^+$ such that $a^{y^{-1}} \in [p, q]$. Uses input parameter $M \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$.

**function** ConjugateToInterval($a, p, q, M$)
  $y := 1$; $c := a$; $i := 0$
  **while** $c \notin [p, q]$ and $i < M$ **do**
    **if** $p \not\leq \inf d$ **then**
      Choose $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ with $\inf c_k < p_k$
      $h := \Delta\tau^{-\inf c_k}(\Delta \wedge (\Delta^{-\inf c_k} c_k))^{-1}$
    **else** ▷ $\sup c \not\leq q$
      Choose $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ with $q_k < \sup c_k$
      Write $c_k$ in normal form $\Delta^{\inf c_k} s_1 \cdots s_l$
      $h := s_l$
    **end if**
    $y := hy$, $c := c^{h^{-1}}$
    $i := i + 1$
  **end while**
  **return** $y$ ▷ Successful if and only if $a^{y^{-1}} \in [p, q]$
**end function**

For an element $a \in G^+$, $G$ a Garside group, let $\|a\|$ be the maximum number of atoms in an expression of $a$ as a product of atoms. For a set $A \subseteq G^r$ and an element $x \in G$, let $A^x = \{\, a^x : a \in A \,\}$. Theorem 2 in [23] extends as follows.

**Theorem 5.2.** *In the notation of Algorithm 2, let $x \in G^+$ be of minimal norm such that $a \in [p,q]^x$. Then:*

1. *The function* ConjugateToInterval$(a, p, q, \infty)$ *terminates after at most $\|x\|$ steps.*
2. *The function outputs an element $y \in G$ satisfying $a^{y^{-1}} \in [p,q]$.*
3. *$x \succeq y$. In particular, $\|y\| \leq \|x\|$.*

*Proof.* (1) By Lemma 5.1, in each step of the while loop, $y$ is a longer suffix of $x$.
(2) By (1).
(3) At the end of each step of the while loop, we have that $d = c^{y^{-1}}$. □

**Definition 5.3.** Let $G$ be a Garside group, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in G^r$. For $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ such that $p \leq q$, the interval $[p,q]$ is *minimal* for the conjugacy class $a^G$ if $[p,q]$ intersects $a^G$, but no proper subinterval of $[p,q]$ intersects $a^G$.

Consider the one-dimensional case. For a Garside group $G$ and an element $a \in G$, the *summit infimum* and *summit supremum* of $a$ are the maximal infimum and minimal supremum, respectively, of an element of $a^G$. In this, one-dimensional case the interval $[\mathrm{suminf}(a), \mathrm{sumsup}(a)]$ is the only minimal interval with respect to $a$. Garside's *Summit Set* [13] and Elrifai–Morton's *Super Summit Set* [10] of $a$ are the sets

$$\begin{aligned} SS(a) &= a^G \cap [\mathrm{suminf}\, a, \infty]; \\ \mathrm{SSS}(a) &= a^G \cap [\mathrm{suminf}\, a, \mathrm{sumsup}\, a], \end{aligned}$$

respectively. These sets are complete conjugacy invariants in the one-dimensional case. In higher dimensions, there are in general more than one minimal interval for a conjugacy class. Any canonical choice among them would provide a complete conjugacy invariant. We will give two examples.

We assume the following hypothesis. This hypothesis generalizes the Birman–Ko–Lee Cycling Theorem [3] to dimension $r > 1$. It asserts that if moving to a proper subinterval is possible, then this can be done in at most $\|\Delta\| - 1$ steps. As usual, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ let $e_i \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ be the vector with all coordinates 0 but the $i$-th, which is 1.

**Conjecture 5.4** (Cycling Conjecture)**.** *Assume that $a \in G^r \cap [p,q]$. For $(p', q') = ((p_1, \ldots, p_r + 1), (q_1, \ldots, q_{r-1}, \infty))$ and for $(p', q') = ((p_1, \ldots, p_r), (q_1, \ldots, q_r - 1))$, we have that the element $y :=$* ConjugateToInterval$(a, p', q', \|\Delta\| - 1)$*, satisfies $a^{y^{-1}} \in [p', q']$ if and only if $a^G \cap [p', q'] \neq \emptyset$.*

We provide below two variations of a complete invariant for simultaneous conjugacy classes. Since we use minimal intervals, these invariants generalize the classic Super Summit Sets to general dimension.

**Definition 5.5.** Let $G$ be a Garside group and $a \in G^r$. The *lexicographically minimal interval* for the conjugacy class $a^G$ is the unique interval $[p,q]$ with the following properties:

1. $p_1$ and $q_1$ are the summit infimum and summit supremum of $a_1$, respectively.
2. For $i = 2, 3, \ldots, r$: $p_i$ is maximal with

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^G \cap [(p_1, \ldots, p_i), (q_1, \ldots, q_{i-1}, \infty)] \neq \emptyset,$$

and $q_i$ is minimal with

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^G \cap [(p_1, \ldots, p_i), (q_1, \ldots, q_i)] \neq \emptyset.$$

The *Lexicographic Super Summit Set* of $a$, $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$, is the intersection of $a^G$ with its lexicographically minimal interval.

The *lexicographically′ minimal interval* for the conjugacy class $a^G$ is the unique interval $[p, q]$ with the following properties:

(1) For $i = 1, \ldots, r$: $p_i$ is maximal with $(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^G \cap [(p_1, \ldots, p_i), \infty] \neq \emptyset$.
(2) For $i = 1, \ldots, r$: $q_i$ is minimal with $(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^G \cap [(p_1, \ldots, p_i), (q_1, \ldots, q_i)] \neq \emptyset$.

The *Lexicographic′ Super Summit Set* of $a$, $\mathrm{LSSS}'(a)$, is the intersection of $a^G$ with its lexicographically′ minimal interval.

If $[p, q]$ is the lexicographically′ minimal interval for a conjugacy class $a^G$, then the set $\mathrm{LSS}(a) := a^G \cap [p, \infty]$ is also a complete invariant for $a^G$, but it may be larger than $\mathrm{LSSS}'(a)$.

Given a lexicographically minimal interval $[p, q]$ for an element $a \in G^r$, one can conjugate $a$ into $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$ using ConjugateToInterval$(a, p, q, \infty)$, and then compute the entire $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$ using Algorithm 1. The computation the lexicographically minimal interval for an element $a$ is performed by Algorithm 3. Analogous assertions hold for $\mathrm{LSSS}'(a)$.

**Algorithm 3** Compute the lexicographically minimal interval $[p, q]$ for an element $a \in G^r$.

**for** $i = 1, \ldots, r$ **do**
  $p_i := \inf a_i$.
  **repeat**
    $y :=$ ConjugateToInterval$((a_1, \ldots, a_i), (p_1, \ldots, p_i + 1), (q_1, \ldots, q_{i-1}, \infty), \|\Delta\| - 1)$
    **if** $(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^{y^{-1}} \in [(p_1, \ldots, p_i + 1), (q_1, \ldots, q_{i-1}, \infty)]$ **then**
      $p_i := p_i + 1$
      $a := a^{y^{-1}}$
      flag := true
    **else**
      flag := false
    **end if**
  **until** flag = false
  $q_i := \sup a_i$.
  **repeat**
    $y :=$ ConjugateToInterval$((a_1, \ldots, a_i), (p_1, \ldots, p_i), (q_1, \ldots, q_i - 1), \|\Delta\| - 1)$
    **if** $(a_1, \ldots, a_i)^{y^{-1}} \in [(p_1, \ldots, p_i + 1), (q_1, \ldots, q_i - 1)]$ **then**
      $q_i := q_i - 1$
      $a := a^{y^{-1}}$
      flag := true
    **else**
      flag := false
    **end if**
  **until** flag = false
**end for**
**return** $p, q$

The following proposition summarizes the relations among the introduced invariants.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group and $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. Let* $\mathrm{proj}_i$ *denote the projection on the first $i$ coordinates. For each $a \in G^r$, the following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{LSS}((a_1, \ldots, a_i)) &= \mathrm{proj}_i(\mathrm{LSS}(a)), \\ \mathrm{LSSS}((a_1, \ldots, a_i)) &= \mathrm{proj}_i(\mathrm{LSSS}(a)), \\ \mathrm{LSSS}'((a_1, \ldots, a_i)) &\subseteq \mathrm{proj}_i(\mathrm{LSSS}'(a)), \\ \mathrm{LSSS}'(a) &\subseteq \mathrm{LSS}(a). \end{aligned}$$

*In particular, we have that $SS(a_1) = \mathrm{proj}_1(\mathrm{LSS}(a))$ and*

$$\mathrm{SSS}(a_1) = \mathrm{proj}_1(\mathrm{LSSS}(a)) \subseteq \mathrm{proj}_1(\mathrm{LSSS}'(a)). \quad \square$$

We conclude this section with a discussion of the situation in the case that the Cycling Conjecture 5.4 fails. If the conjecture holds for some value $M$ (depending only on the group $G$) instead of our conjectured $\|\Delta\|-1$, then replacing $M$ for $\|\Delta\|-1$ everything works. If this is not the case, one may give up the idea of an invariant, and compute instead *some* minimal interval. This still provides a solution of the SCP and the Search SCP, and experimental results suggest that the specific choice of the minimal interval does not matter much for the complexity of the solution. The algorithms of the present section are still useful in this scenario: to compute the intersection of $a^G$ with one of its minimal intervals, execute Algorithm 3 on $a$ to find a proposal $p, q$ for a minimal interval. Note that Algorithm 3 also changes $a$ to a conjugate in the interval $[p, q]$. Then, execute Algorithm 1 to compute the entire $a^G \cap [p, q]$. For each new element $c$ of $a^G \cap [p, q]$, check whether the interval $[\inf c, \sup c]$ is a proper subinterval of $[p, q]$. If this is the case, erase everything outside $[\inf c, \sup c]$ and continue with the smaller interval $[p, q] := [\inf c, \sup c]$.

This completes our treatment of interval minimization. We next address the second and last problem: removing the need to conjugate by all simple elements in each step of our algorithms. This will be done by extending the method of minimal simple elements to our situation.

## 6. Minimal simple elements

We apply the technique of minimal simple elements, introduced by González–Meneses and Franco in [11], in order to make the computation of the sets $a^G \cap [p, q]$ more efficient. The propositions and algorithms in this section are natural generalizations of the ones in [11, 17, 20]. We follow [11] and [20].

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group. Let $v \in G^r$ with $v \in [p, q]$, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. For $i = 1, \ldots, r$, write $v_i = \Delta^{p_i} w_i = z_i \Delta^{p_i}$ with $w_i, z_i \in G^+$ and $(w_i^{-1} \Delta^{q_i - p_i}), (\Delta^{q_i - p_i} z_i^{-1}) \in G^+$. Let $s \in S$.*

(1) *$v^s \in [p, q]$ if and only if*

$$\tau^{p_i}(s) \preceq w_i s \text{ and } \tau^{-q_i}(s) \preceq (\Delta^{q_i - p_i} z_i^{-1}) s$$

*for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$.*

(2) *$v^{s^{-1}} \in [p, q]$ if and only if*

$$s z_i \succeq \tau^{-p_i}(s) \text{ and } s(w_i^{-1} \Delta^{q_i - p_i}) \succeq \tau^{q_i}(s)$$

*for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$.*

*Proof.* (1) For $i = 1, \dots, r$, we have that $\Delta^{p_i} \leq v_i^s \leq \Delta^{q_i}$ if and only if $\Delta^{p_i} \preceq v_i^s \preceq \Delta^{q_i}$. Since $\preceq$ is invariant under left multiplication, we have $\Delta^{p_i} \preceq s^{-1}\Delta^{p_i} w_i s$ if and only if $\tau^{p_i}(s) \preceq w_i s$, and $s^{-1} z_i \Delta^{p_i} s \preceq \Delta^{q_i}$ is equivalent to $s \preceq \Delta^{-p_i} z_i^{-1} s \Delta^{q_i} = \tau^{q_i}(\Delta^{q_i - p_i} z_i^{-1} s)$. By invariance of $\preceq$ under the automorphism $\tau$, we have that $\tau^{-q_i}(s) \preceq (\Delta^{q_i - p_i} z_i^{-1}) s$.

(2) Here, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, we use that $\Delta^{p_i} \leq v_i^{s^{-1}} \leq \Delta^{q_i}$ if and only if $\Delta^{q_i} \succeq v_i^{s^{-1}} \succeq \Delta^{p_i}$. Since $\succeq$ is invariant under right multiplication, we conclude that $s z_i \Delta^{p_i} s^{-1} \succeq \Delta^{p_i}$ if and only if $s z_i \succeq \tau^{-p_i}(s)$, and $\Delta^{q_i} \succeq s \Delta^{p_i} w_i s^{-1}$ is equivalent to $\Delta^{q_i} s w_i^{-1} \Delta^{-p_i} = \tau^{-q_i}(s w_i^{-1} \Delta^{q_i - p_i}) \succeq s$. By invariance of $\succeq$ under $\tau$, we have that $s(w_i^{-1} \Delta^{q_i - p_i}) \succeq \tau^{q_i}(s)$. □

**Lemma 6.2.** *Assume that a set $A \subseteq S$ is closed under the operator $\wedge$ (respectively, $\tilde{\wedge}$). Let $x \in A$. If the set $\{\, s \in A : x \preceq s \,\}$ (respectively, $\{\, s \in A : s \succeq x \,\}$) is nonempty, then it has a unique minimal element with respect to $\preceq$ (respectively, $\succeq$).*

*Proof.* Every interval $\{\, x \in G^+ : a \preceq x \preceq b \,\}$ in the poset $(G^+, \preceq)$ is closed under the operators $\wedge$ and $\vee$. The intersection of sets closed under the operators $\wedge$ and $\vee$ is also closed under these operations. Uniqueness follows. □

**Definition 6.3.** Let $G$ be a Garside group, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, and $v \in [p, q]$. Let $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{right}}(v)$ be the set of all $\preceq$-minimal $s \in S$ such that $v^s \in [p, q]$. Similarly, let $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{left}}(v)$ be the set of all $\succeq$-minimal $s \in S$ such that $v^{s^{-1}} \in [p, q]$.

Analogously to the proof of [17, Proposition 2.2], one has the following.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group. For $a, c \in [p, q] \subseteq G^r$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) *$a$ and $c$ are conjugate.*

(2) *There exist $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_{l-1} \in a^G \cap [p, q]$, $\tilde{s}_i \in S^{[p,q]}_{\text{right}}(\tilde{w}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq l$, such that*

$$a \xleftarrow{\tilde{s}_1} \tilde{w}_1 \xleftarrow{\tilde{s}_2} \cdots \xleftarrow{\tilde{s}_{l-1}} \tilde{w}_{l-1} \xleftarrow{\tilde{s}_l} c.$$

(3) *There exist $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_1, \dots, w_{l-1} \in a^G \cap [p, q]$, $s_i \in S^{[p,q]}_{\text{left}}(w_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq l$, such that*

$$a \xrightarrow{s_1} w_1 \xrightarrow{s_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{s_{l-1}} w_{l-1} \xrightarrow{s_l} c. \quad \square$$

The set $\{\, s \in S : v^s \in [p, q] \,\}$ is closed under the operator $\wedge$. It follows (cf. [11, Corollary 4.3]) that for each $s \in S^{[p,q]}_{\text{right}}(v)$ there is an atom $x \in S$ such that $s$ is the unique $\preceq$-minimal element of the set $\{\, a \in S : x \preceq a \text{ and } v^a \in [p, q] \,\}$. Similarly, each element of $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{left}}(v)$ is the unique $\succeq$-minimal element of the set $\{\, a \in S : a \succeq x \text{ and } v^a \in [p, q] \,\}$ for some atom $x \in S$. It follows that, in Algorithm 1, the computation of $a^G \cap [p, q]$ can be done with $S$ replaced by $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{right}}(v)$, a set not larger than the number of *atoms* in $S$. For example, the Artin groups of type $A_N$, $B_N$, and $D_N$, respectively, with their classical Garside structure, have $(N+1)!$, $N!2^N$, and $N!2^{N-1}$ simple elements, but only $N$ atoms.

Algorithms 4, 5 and 6, build on algorithms from [11, 17, 20].

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let $G$ be a Garside group, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, $v \in [p, q] \subseteq G^r$, and $x \in S$. Algorithm 4 terminates and provides the correct output.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.1 (1), we need to find the smallest $r_x$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, $x \preceq r_x$, $\tau^{p_i}(s) \preceq w_i s$ and $\tau^{-q_i}(s) \preceq w_i' s$ with $w_i' = \Delta^{q_i - p_i} z_i^{-1}$. We take a simple element $s$ such that $x \preceq s \preceq r_x$, initializing with $s := x$. Then, for $k$ such that $\tau^{p_k}(s) \not\preceq w_k s$

**Algorithm 4** Compute the minimal element in $\{\, a \in S : x \preceq a \text{ and } v^a \in [p,q] \,\}$, for an atom $x$.

Express $v_i = \Delta^{p_i} w_i = z_i \Delta^{p_i}$
$s := x$
**while** $\exists k,\ \tau^{p_k}(s) \not\preceq w_k s$ or $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \not\preceq (\Delta^{q_k - p_k} z_k^{-1}) s$ **do**
  Choose such a $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$
  Compute $s_1 \in S$ such that $\tau^{p_k}(s) \vee w_k s = w_k s s_1$
  $w'_k := \Delta^{q_k - p_k} z_k^{-1}$
  Compute $s_2 \in S$ such that $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \vee w'_k s = w'_k s s_2$
  $s' := s_1 \vee s_2$
  $s := s s'$
  $r_x := s$
**end while**
**return** $r_x$

or $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \not\preceq (\Delta^{q_k - p_k} z_k^{-1}) s$, we compute $s_1, s_2 \in G$ such that $\tau^{p_k}(s) \vee w_k s = w_k s s_1$ and $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \vee w'_k s = w'_k s s_2$. If $s' := s_1 \vee s_2 = 1$, then $s_1 = s_2 = 1$, and we have that $\tau^p(s) \preceq ws$ and $\tau^{-q}(s) \preceq w's$, in contradiction to the choice of $k$. Thus, $s' \neq 1$. $s \preceq r_x$ implies that $\tau^{p_k}(s) \preceq \tau^{p_k}(r_x) \preceq w_k r_x$, and by left-invariance of $\preceq$, it also implies that $w_k s \preceq w_k r_x$, i.e., that $\tau^{p_k}(s), w_k s \preceq w_k r_x$. By the definition of right lcm, we have that $\tau^{p_k}(s) \vee w_k s = w_k s s_1 \preceq w_k r_x$, and therefore $s s_1 \preceq r_x$.

Furthermore, $s \preceq r_x$ implies that $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \preceq \tau^{-q_k}(r_x) \preceq w'_k r_x$, and by left-invariance of $\preceq$ it also implies that $w'_k s \preceq w'_k r_x$, i.e., that $\tau^{-q_k}(s), w'_k s \preceq w'_k r_x$. By the definition of right lcm, we have that $\tau^{-q_k}(s) \vee w'_k s = w'_k s s_2 \preceq w'_k r_x$, and therefore $s s_2 \preceq r_x$.

From $s s_1 \preceq r_x$ and $s s_2 \preceq r_x$ we conclude that $s s_1 \vee s s_2 = s(s_1 \vee s_2) = s s' \preceq r_x$. Thus, if $s$ is not equal to $r_x$, then Algorithm 4 gives an element $s' \neq 1$ such that $s \preceq s s' \preceq r_x$, and it starts again checking whether $s s' = r_x$. Since the number of left divisors of $r_x$ is finite, this process must terminate. Therefore, Algorithm 4 finds the requested minimal element in finite time. □

**Algorithm 5** Compute the minimal element of $\{\, a \in S : a \succeq x \text{ and } v^a \in [p,q] \,\}$, for an atom $x \in S$.

Express $v_i = \Delta^{p_i} w_i = z_i \Delta^{p_i}$
$s := x$
**while** $\exists k,\ s z_k \not\succeq \tau^{-p_k}(s)$ and $s(w_k^{-1} \Delta^{q_k - p_k}) \succeq \tau^{q_k}(s)$ **do**
  Compute $s_1 \in S$ such that $\tau^{-p_k}(s) \tilde{\vee} s z_k = s_1 s z_k$
  $w'_k := w_k^{-1} \Delta^{q_k - p_k}$
  Compute $s_2 \in S$ such that $\tau^{q_k}(s) \tilde{\vee} s w'_k = s_2 s w'_k$
  $s' := s_1 \tilde{\vee} s_2$
  $s := s' s$
**end while**
$r_x := s$
**return** $r_x$

The sets of minimal simple elements $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{right}}(v)$ and $S^{[p,q]}_{\text{left}}(v)$ can be computed by comparing the elements $r_x$, for all atoms $x$ of $G^+$, and keeping the minimal ones. Since it is faster to

check whether an atom divides a simple element than to compare two simple elements, we prefer to use [11, Algorithm 3] (see Proposition 5.3 there).

**Algorithm 6** Compute $S^{[p,q]}_{\mathrm{right}}(v)$ or $S^{[p,q]}_{\mathrm{left}}(v)$.

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be the atoms of $G$
$R := \emptyset$
**for** $i = 1, \ldots, m$ **do**
  Compute $r_{x_i}$ using Algorithm 4 or Algorithm 5, respectively
  $J_i := \{\, j : j \in R \text{ and } x_j \preceq r_{x_i} (\text{or } r_{x_i} \succeq x_j) \,\}$
  $K_i := \{\, j : j > i \text{ and } x_j \preceq r_{x_i} (\text{or } r_{x_i} \succeq x_j) \,\}$
  **if** $J_i = K_i = \emptyset$ **then**
    $R := R \cup \{i\}$
  **end if**
**end for**
**return** $\{\, r_{x_i} : i \in R \,\}$

We conclude by pointing out that, since our invariants are preserved by the automorphism $\tau$, it would be more natural to consider them *modulo* $\tau$, that is, to maintain only one representative (for example, the lexicographically minimal one) out of each $\tau$-orbit. For example, the order of $\tau$ for two known Garside structures in braid groups $\mathrm{B}_N$ with $N \geq 4$ strands, namely, the Artin–Garside structure with Garside element $\Delta = \Delta_N$ and the dual or Birman–Ko–Lee structure [2] with $\Delta = \delta_N$, are 2 and $N$, respectively.

## 7. Experimental results in the braid groups

We have conducted a number of experiments checking the sizes of the various finite sets that may be used for solving the SCP. The experiments were conducted in Artin's braid groups $\mathrm{B}_N$, with their two known Garside structures (Artin and BKL). For $a \in \mathrm{B}_N^r$, the set $a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \infty]$ is the one proposed by Lee and Lee [23]. The set $a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \sup c]$ is its natural subset introduced above. None of these sets is an invariant of the conjugacy class. The sets $\mathrm{LSS}(a)$ and $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$ are the invariants introduced here, namely the lexicographic summit set and the lexicographic super summit set.

We did not notice any substantial difference between the sizes of the two variations of LSSS introduced here. Thus, we used in the experiments the second variation, so that $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$ is always a subset of $\mathrm{LSS}(a)$. This allows the use of a smaller number of experiments, without being distracted by problems arising from the large variance.

To give the two sets that are not invariants a fair evaluation, we considered the following distributions: we constructed conjugate $a, c \in \mathrm{B}_N^r$ by choosing random elements $b \in \mathrm{B}_N^r$ and $x, y \in \mathrm{B}_N$, and setting $a = b^x$ and $c = b^y$.

It remains to specify how random elements of $\mathrm{B}_N$ were chosen. This was done by taking a product of random $\lceil 2N \log N \rceil$ generators, each inverted in probability $1/2$, so that the products will be, with high probability, fully supported in the group.

The results are summarized in Table 1, and can be summarized as the following typical inequalities:

$$|\mathrm{LSSS}(a)| < |\mathrm{LSS}(a)| \ll \left|a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \sup c]\right| < \left|a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \infty]\right|.$$

The symbol $\ll$ indicates a dramatic improvement when moving to the invariants. An additional observation is that the BKL presentation provides much smaller sets, often one-element sets!

TABLE 1. Sizes of sets (modulo $\tau$) associated to the SCP, for dimension $r = 8$. Each cell lists the minimum, median, and maximum size encountered, as well as the percentage of failures, out of 100 experiments. $\infty$ means $> 100{,}000$.

| | $a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \infty]$ | | $a^{\mathrm{B}_N} \cap [\inf c, \sup c]$ | | LSS($a$) | | LSSS($a$) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $N$ | Artin | BKL | Artin | BKL | Artin | BKL | Artin | BKL |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 116 | 54 | 37 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 80,438 | 27,786 | 14,318 | 3,441 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 8 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 40,630 | 872 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 63 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 3,732 | 966 | 160 | 17 |
| | 100% | 100% | 98% | 96% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 16 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 69,534 | 2 | 68 | 1 |
| | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 740 | 76,509 | 6 |
| | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 28,025 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 10% | 76% | 0% |

We have also tested, for the BKL presentation (that turned out better in our setting) the effect of increasing the dimension. Table 2 summarizes the results. One sees that the size of the invariant LSSS tends to 1 with the increase of the dimension, and suggests that when $r = O(N)$ and the elements of the $r$-tuple are "generic" and independent, the invariant tends to have size 1.

TABLE 2. The effect of increasing the dimension $r$ on the size of the Birman–Ko–Lee Lexicographic SSS invariant (modulo $\tau$), for braid index $N = 32$. Each cell lists the minimum, median, and maximum size encountered, out of 100 experiments. $\infty$ means $> 100{,}000$.

| $r$ | 4 | 8 | 16 | 32 | 64 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum | $\infty$ | 720 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Median | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 95 | 2 | 1 |
| Maximum | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | 75 | 4 |
| Failures | 100% | 75% | 3% | 0% | 0% |

## 8. Comments, open problems and further work

In Section 2 we reduced several problems to the conjunction of the Search SCP and the computation of the centralizer of a set. At present, no efficient algorithms for the computation of the centralizers of sets with more than one element in the braid groups are known. The computation of the centralizer of a single element in braid groups involves methods used to solve the conjugacy problem there [12].

**Problem 8.1.** *Does the computation of the centralizer of a set in the braid groups reduce to the Search SCP in these groups?*

Proving the Cycling Conjecture 5.4 for $r > 1$, or providing any effectively computable upper bound would render our invariants provably computable. Note that our invariants are provably computable in Garside groups with weighted presentation.

The Lexicographic Super Summit Sets depend on the order of entries in the $r$-tuple. We may gain a lot of insight by finding an invariant, computable in comparable time, that does not depend on the order of the entries. Even better would be an invariant $I$ such that, for each $a \in G^r$ and every choice of generators $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ of the group generated by $a_1, \ldots, a_r$, we have that $I(b_1, \ldots, b_m) = I(a)$.

Our invariants may be very large. Having finite invariants of conjugacy classes implies having canonical representatives, e.g., the lexicographically minimal elements of the invariants. These form invariants of size 1, but the computational complexity of computing such a canonical representative remains proportional to the size of the initial invariant.

In the one-dimensional case, there are the two much better (essentially, equivalent) invariants of Ultra Summit Sets [15] and Sliding Circuits [16].

**Problem 8.2.** *Is there a generalization of Ultra Summit Sets or Sliding Circuits to the high-dimensional setting?*

Dehornoy pointed out to us that some of the conditions in the definition of Garside groups, like Noetherianity assumptions, are often not needed to establish results about them. In particular, the normal form exists whenever one has a "Garside family" [7, 8]. Much that was done for Garside groups extends to Garside families, and it is natural to expect that our work can be extended to arbitrary Garside families.

It is also natural to consider potential applications of this work to cryptanalysis. As can be seen in 2, the reductions to the Search SCP provide highly biased instances. The dependency among the entries seems to render the invariants too large to be of direct use. The Search SCP has the following heuristic speedup, that is relevant also to the one-dimensional case and was apparently not suggested earlier: compute $\mathrm{LSSS}(a)$ and $\mathrm{LSSS}(c)$ in parallel, until an element in the intersection is found. This has the potential to reduce the running time from $n := |\mathrm{LSSS}(a)|$ to about $\sqrt{n}$. This improvement alone, however, is unlikely to be sufficient for cryptographic applications, where the involved parameters are very large. To this end, the invariants may be combined with heuristic shortcuts, like the ones in [18]. We plan to consider this direction in a future work.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Patrick Dehornoy for providing us information about representation theory of Garside groups and Garside families, and David Garber for useful discussions. We acknowledge that Milton Chowdhury, in a sequence of arXiv eprints posted during 2006 and 2007 (eprints 0611065, 0708.2395, 0708.2397 and 0708.2571), was among the first to try and relate various cryptographic problems to the conjugacy problem and its simultaneous version. The first named author was supported by the Minerva Foundation of Germany.

## References

[1] I. Anshel, M. Anshel, D. Goldfeld, *An algebraic method for public-key cryptography*, Mathematical Research Letters **6** (1999), 287–291.

[2] J. Birman, K. Ko, S. Lee, *New approaches to the word and conjugacy problem in the braid groups*, Advances in Mathematics **139** (1998), 322–353.
[3] J. Birman, K. Ko, S. Lee, *The infimum, supremum and geodesic length of a braid conjugacy class*, Advances in Mathematics **164** (2001), 41–56.
[4] J. Cheon, B. Jun, *A polynomial time algorithm for the braid Diffie–Hellman conjugacy problem*, CRYPTO 2003, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **2729** (2003), 212–224.
[5] J. Cha, K. Ko, S. Lee, J. Han, J. Cheon, *An efficient implementation of braid groups*, ASIACRYPT 2001, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **2248** (2001), 144–156.
[6] P. Dehornoy, *Using shifted conjugacy in braid-based cryptography*, Contemporary Mathematics **418** (2006) 65–73.
[7] P. Dehornoy, F. Digne, J. Michel, *Garside families and Garside germs*, Journal of Algebra **380** (2013), 109–145.
[8] P. Dehornoy, with F. Digne, E. Godelle, J. Michel, **Foundations of Garside Theory**, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, to appear. `http://www.math.unicaen.fr/~garside/Garside.pdf`
[9] P. Dehornoy, L. Paris, *Gaussian groups and Garside groups, two generalizations of Artin groups*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **79** (1999), 569–604.
[10] E. Elrifai, H. Morton, *Algorithms for positive braids*, Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **45** (1994), 479–497.
[11] N. Franco, J. González–Meneses, *Conjugacy problem for braid groups and Garside groups*, Journal of Algebra **266** (2003), 112–132.
[12] N. Franco, J. González–Meneses, *Computation of centralizers in braid groups and Garside groups*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **19** (2003), 367–384.
[13] F. Garside, *The braid group and other groups*, Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **20** (1969), 235–254.
[14] D. Garber, A. Kalka, E. Liberman, M. Teicher, *Centralizers of centralizers of parabolic subgroups of braid groups*, arXiv eprint 1310.0936
[15] V. Gebhardt, *A new approach to the conjugacy problem in Garside groups*, Journal of Algebra **292** (2005), 282–302.
[16] V. Gebhardt, J. González–Meneses, *The cyclic sliding operation in Garside groups*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **265** (2010), 85–114.
[17] J. Gonzáles–Meneses, *Improving an algorithm to solve Multiple Simultaneous Conjgugacy Problem in braid groups*, Contemporary Mathematics **372** (2005), 35–42.
[18] D. Hofheinz, R. Steinwandt, *A practical attack on some braid group based cryptographic primitives*, PKC 2003, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **2567** (2002), 187–198.
[19] A. Kalka, E. Liberman, M. Teicher, *A Note on the Shifted Conjugacy Problem in braid groups*, Groups–Complexity–Cryptology **1** (2009), 227–230.
[20] A. Kalka, E. Liberman, M. Teicher, *Solution to the subgroup conjugacy problem for Garside subgroups of Garside groups*, Groups–Complexity–Cryptology **2** (2010), 157–174.
[21] A. Kalka, M. Teicher, B. Tsaban, *On the Double Coset Problem for parabolic subgroups of Artin's braid groups*, arXiv eprint 1402.5541
[22] K. Ko, S. Lee, J. Cheon, J. Han, J. Kang, C. Park, *New public-key cryptosystem using braid groups*, CRYPTO 2000, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **1880** (2000), 166–183.
[23] S. Lee, E. Lee, *Potential weaknesses of the commutator key agreement protocol based on braid groups*, EUROCRYPT 2002, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **2332** (2002), 14–28.
[24] M. Picantin, *The conjugacy problem in small Gaussian groups*, Communications in Algebra **29** (2001), 1021–1039.
[25] M. Picantin, *Automatic structures for torus link groups*, Journal of Knot Theory and its Ramifications **12** (2003), 1–34.
[26] V. Shpilrain, A. Ushakov, *A new key exchange protocol besed on the decomposition problem*, in: L. Gerritzen, D. Goldfeld, M. Kreuzer, G. Rosenberger and V. Shpilrain, eds., **Algebraic Methods in Cryptography**, Contemporary Mathematics **418** (2006), 161–167.
[27] B. Tsaban, *Polynomial time solutions of computational problems in noncommutative-algebraic cryptography*, Journal of Cryptology, to appear.
[28] A. Aizenbud, B. Tsaban, *Feasible polynomial time solutions of several major problems in noncommutative-algebraic cryptography*, in preparation.

(Kalka, Vinokur) Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel

*E-mail address*: Arkadius.Kalka@rub.de, vinokur777@gmail.com

(Tsaban) Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel; and Faculty of Mathematics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel

*E-mail address*: tsaban@math.biu.ac.il